

This is a repository copy of *Scoping the literature on Patient travel abroad for cancer screening, diagnosis and treatment*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/178429/>

Version: Published Version

Article:

Lunt, Neil orcid.org/0000-0002-4501-1999 and Fung, Ka (2021) Scoping the literature on Patient travel abroad for cancer screening, diagnosis and treatment. International Journal of Health Planning and Management. ISSN 1099-1751

<https://doi.org/10.1002/hpm.3315>

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

REVIEW ARTICLE

WILEY

Scoping the literature on patient travel abroad for cancer screening, diagnosis and treatment

Neil Lunt¹  | Ka-wo Fung²

¹Department of Social Policy and Social Work,
University of York, York, UK

²Department of Social Work, Soochow
University, Taipei, Taiwan

Correspondence

Neil Lunt, Department of Social Policy and
Social Work, University of York, York YO10
5DD, UK.

Email: Neil.lunt@york.ac.uk

Funding information

Wellcome Trust : 204829
Centre for Futures Health

Abstract

The incidence of cancer is on the rise globally. Under particular circumstances, patients are willing to travel abroad for healthcare treatments. We know relatively little however about patients travelling overseas for cancer-related screening, diagnosis and treatment. Where do patients go, for what treatments, what are their motivations, decision-making processes and treatment experiences? What do we know about patient safety and risk, and outcomes? More broadly, what are the ethical and legal implications? This review presents the first published assessment of what we term 'transnational oncology treatment', defined as patients travelling overseas or across borders for cancer screening, diagnosis and treatment. The review undertakes detailed search and retrieval of the literature, using an accepted scoping review method. We present a narrative review of existing knowledge and themes, identifying coverage and gaps. There is a five-fold agenda for future investigation: trajectories and itineraries; in depth focus on treatment decisions, experiences and outcomes; locating patient travel within wider health system analysis; exploration of professional perspectives and coordination; and situating travel within the context of health trade. Such an agenda is multidisciplinary and wide-ranging, encompassing epidemiology, health econom-

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2021 The Authors. The International Journal of Health Planning and Management published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

ics, health policy ethics, health politics, health management, and health policy.

KEYWORDS

cancer, cross-border, health system, oncology, transnational, treatment overseas

1 | BACKGROUND

There is a robust evidence base on the incidence, costs, and implications of cancers globally. In 2019, there were 17 million new cases of cancer diagnosed worldwide, one in six deaths was due to the disease, and 70% occurred in low- and middle-income countries.¹ Estimated annual costs of cancer were US\$ 116 billion.²

Whilst the total number of cancer deaths globally is increasing as a result of population growth and ageing, death rates are in fact falling as a result of earlier detection and better treatments. For developed health systems within the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the availability and waiting times for cancer screening, diagnosis and treatment, alongside evidence of survival-rates, are markers of national system performance and equity.³ Low- and middle-income countries suffer disproportionately from cancers (and cancers with causes due to infection and tobacco), and the unequal distribution of cancer care resources in these countries produce global oncological disparities in diagnosis and treatment.^{4,5} Developed health systems continuously advance cancer treatments and technology – diagnostics, new surgical and radiography techniques, and pharma and gene therapy. Patients and patient groups exert pressure to make interventions widely available, and regulators assess treatment safety and value for money.^{6,7}

Contemporary patient mobility has burgeoned given transformations of economic production, trade patterns, travel, regional political and trade cooperation, treatment innovation, web-based resources, and socio-cultural trends such as patient voice and consumerism. Scholarship has identified patients travelling for treatments including elective surgery, transplantation, cosmetic treatment, fertility and dental care. Over the past decade, literature has addressed diverse treatments and travel routes.^{8–13} Yet as Kaspar (p.125) notes,¹⁴ ‘research on medical travel has hitherto largely underestimated cancer’. The lacunae is surprising given the prognosis of cancer increases demand for timely, effective and, what are perceived as, higher quality treatments. On the supply side, investment in high-end cancer treatment by private and public healthcare are premised, at least in part, on international patients.¹⁵ We review the broad field of cancer travel overseas to clarify the current state of published research and commentary, and to identify the sorts of things we know and do not know. In noting the uneven coverage of current research literature, we identify five key themes for future attention: trajectories and itineraries; in depth focus on treatment decisions, experiences and outcomes; locating patient travel within wider health system analysis; professional perspectives and coordination; and situating travel within the context of health trade. The article will be structured as follows. First, an overview of the research problem and the search approach used to address it. Second, an overview of the main themes: Itineraries (who travels, where, for what and why); Treatment processes and challenges; Patient safety, risk and outcomes; Ethical, legal and regulatory considerations. Third, we discuss the significance of findings and their implications for future research directions.

2 | RESEARCH PROBLEM AND METHOD

This narrative review brings together existing literature on *transnational oncology treatment* defined as patients travelling overseas or across borders for cancer screening, diagnosis and treatment. The dataset of this scoping review consists of a systemic search that identified 104 articles related to cross-border cancer treatments from four electronic databases, namely ProQuest, Web of Science, Scopus (where Medline is covered) and EMBASE.

The initial search was conducted on May 2020 with the search terms 'cancer/tumour' in conjunction with 'medical travel', 'medical tourism', 'treatment & overseas/abroad', 'cross-border & care', 'cross-border & travel' and 'foreign country'. The range of this search covered academic articles (book chapters, conference papers, dissertations and scholarly journals) whose title, abstract or key word was in English and matched those search terms, from the earliest date available to the present. The pilot search included 'patient mobility' but it generated over 6000 articles with many of them using 'patient mobility' in a clinical sense (cancer patients' physical ability to move following treatment). That search term was left out in the initial stage. A total of 2975 articles were finally included for screening (including duplicates among different electronic databases [see Table 1]). We undertook a hand search and added relevant articles not identified within the search strategy. In the screening stage, articles whose title, abstract or key word had direct relevance to cross-border cancer treatments were included and the remaining went through a full-text search for further clarification. We reviewed full articles available in English. For inclusion, articles needed substantial coverage of transnational cancer and oncology treatment. This would necessarily exclude domestic focused discussions of cancer treatment, and we also excluded articles that listed oncology as one treatment amongst many (e.g., in broader discussions of medical travel that encompassed fertility, dental, cosmetic, orthopaedic, ophthalmic, transplantation, see Figure 1).

Our approach draws on the framework of Arksey and O'Malley,¹⁶ and aims to contextualise 'knowledge in terms of identifying the current state of understanding, identifying the sorts of things we know and do not know; and then setting this within policy and practice contexts (Results in EMBASE and Scopus focus more on the medical treatment than the travel aspect of the search. They were included in the dataset if the preset inclusion criteria were met.).¹⁷

Our coverage was intentionally broad, embracing clinical, health, social science and policy literature on screening, surgery, including transplantation, and forms of adjunct therapy (e.g., radiotherapy, chemotherapy, hormone, immunotherapy). The benefit of a scoping review is its ability to survey the broad range of activity and to open routes for further research and discussion.

2.1 | Itineraries: who travels where, for what and why?

The cartography of oncology travel is complex. There is travel into high-income countries for treatments either unavailable or perceived as higher quality, for example from Kuwait and UAE to North America and Europe.^{18–20} There are examples of Diasporic travel, including Korean-American travel to Korea for screening^{21–24} and Mexican-Americans returning to Mexico²⁵; flows between places with previous colonial relations with African women travelling to Paris and northern France for cancer treatments²⁶; and flows between smaller states and regional partners such as Tonga to New Zealand within the Pacific,²⁷ including bilateral health agreements, for example Bahrain to Turkey.²⁸

Regionalised flows exist within Africa to South Africa²⁹; from Central Asia to India,¹⁴ and between Laos and Thailand³⁰; Bangladesh and Singapore³¹; and into Malaysia and Thailand^{32,33} and into Jordan from neighbouring countries.³⁴ Canadian, Mexican and South American patients travel to the United States for cancer treatment with Canadians being outsourced by their domestic health care system and most South American patients paying out of pocket.^{35–37} Intra-European flows included Italy to France,³⁸ and Austria to Germany.³⁹ Individual facilities in Japan,⁴⁰ Singapore,⁴¹ and India⁴² identify in-country travel from a range of overseas destinations for cancer treatment. There were reports of 'conflict related flows' of cancer patients from Iraq to Lebanon,⁴³ and growing awareness of how conflict and dislocation impact on patients requiring cancer treatment.

TABLE 1 Key search terms and databases

Search term	ProQuest	Scopus	Web of science	EMBASE
'Medical travel' & cancer/tumour	6	12	13	70
'Medical tourism' & cancer/tumour	17	74	58	71
Treatment & overseas/abroad & cancer/tumour	197	733	343	913
Cross-border & care & cancer/tumour	13	29	23	39
Cross-border & travel & cancer/tumour	2	5	6	10
'Foreign country' & cancer/tumour	10	161	10	160
Total (including duplicates)	245	1014	453	1263




FIGURE 1 PRISMA flow diagram for the scoping review process

Countries could be both senders and receivers of cancer patients. For example, Kuwait acted as a treatment hub for expatriates⁴⁴ but also sponsored its own citizens' treatment abroad, including to the UK, Germany and the United States.¹⁹ Similarly, the UK treated international patients from UAE²⁰ but also outsourced paediatric treatments for its own citizens currently unavailable in the UK to the United States, notably Proton Beam Therapy.^{45,46}

There was little robust evidence on precise traveller numbers, aside from limited self-reports at the provider level^{30,41,42} and, occasionally, figures of Gulf Government sponsorship programmes.^{19,20} It is not straightforward to identify patient numbers, episodes of care, time periods spent overseas, and costs of treatment. Treatments are funded by individuals out of pocket and through family support including travel for screening but also encompassing long-term expensive treatments including from LMIC countries into developed health care systems and from conflict zones to neighbouring countries,^{26,34,43} and via established state-sponsored programmes such as those from the Gulf States.^{18–20} There were few examples of travel funded by private or occupational insurance; an exception being African regional travel for breast cancer treatment, with 70% of patients utilising private insurance.²⁹

The full range of treatments and therapies was reflected in the literature we found and included: screening^{22–24}; surgery³⁰; radiation^{30,36,45,47}; chemotherapy^{30,47}; and transplantation of organs^{48,49} and bone marrow²⁸ but with few discernible patterns (Liver transplantation is a treatment for Hepatocellular carcinoma). Similarly, travel was for all types of cancer sites including: prostate³⁶; breast,^{29,37,50} colorectal²¹; lymphoma⁵⁰; cervical^{23,47}; and brain.⁴⁵ The focus of articles was primarily curative, but some identified palliative care within treatment pathways.^{25,32,51–53}

Around 20 articles (clinical cases, legal, ethical and policy discussions) focused on paediatric oncology, frequently linked to Proton Beam Therapy including national travel policy for the UK,⁴⁵ Denmark,⁵⁴ and Ireland.⁵⁵ There was related coverage of treatment abroad for rare childhood cancers.^{35,39,41,56} Single clinical case reports in paediatric services and adult services, identified **adverse effects and complications** of travel, including misdiagnosis,⁵⁷ and risks from experimental live therapeutic agents⁵⁸ and Complementary and Alternative Treatments.⁵⁹

Patient motivations for travelling abroad were **second opinions** on diagnosis and treatment.^{14,18,26,53,60} Some patients accessed treatments that were **unavailable** in the home country either because they were not approved despite being routinely available in other countries [for example, Proton Beam Therapy⁵⁹] or because they were **experimental and alternative** therapeutics that fell outside accepted treatments for which there was no evidence of clinical efficacy and safety.^{58,61} Patients also travel for standard treatments that are not available within the domestic health system including regionalised travel for example where services are offered in South Africa and Jordan to those in neighbouring countries.^{29,34,43} Patients were motivated to seek what they perceived as better **quality services abroad** which include travel by Korean Americans to Korea for screening and intra-European flows,^{19,20,23,38} coupled with a **lack of confidence** in services available at home, something for example noted regarding patient outflows from Gulf states.^{19,20} Identifying those travelling because they need truly specialised care only available abroad, and those who still choose to travel despite services being available locally is contentious.¹⁸ **Familiarity** with a health system was important motivation for undergoing screening and receiving some treatments.^{23,24,52} Travel decisions may ultimately rest on multiple motivations. Aside from screening,²³ travelling explicitly for **cost** or **privacy** reasons were not detailed within the literature as primary motivations.

2.2 | Treatment processes and challenges

Travel decisions involve clinical networks and referral pathways which may include relationships between clinical centres when services are unavailable in one country due to size, cost or lack of specialisation.^{28,39,45} Clinicians may also make informal suggestions to patients for further treatment options, drawing on experience of previous clinical residency or overseas connections.²⁶ Travel decisions may be contra to local clinical advice where domestic clinical teams do not support, and may counsel against, travel abroad by an adult or child patient.^{18,62} Conversely, there is also some reporting of patients choosing not to travel abroad for chemotherapy and radiotherapy despite such treatment overseas being advised by local clinicians as part of a continuous treatment pathway.⁴⁷ Family took a key role in decision-making for adult cancer patients,^{14,19,29} and word of mouth and acquaintance with others previously treated in a facility was also a factor in decision making for both screening and treatment intervention.^{23,29} There was little explicit discussion of brokerage and intermediaries within decision-making, travel and treatment arrangements. Analysis of provider literature marketing the range of medical treatments identified standard cancer treatments as the most

prevalently marketed of all clinical specialties,^{63,64} and the literature on ethnic media marketing has a role in informing decisions for cancer screening.²³

Culturally competent care,^{18,35,40,44,53} including language and ability to communicate complex medical issues during treatment, was highlighted as a fundamental concern.^{28,35,56} In a survey of overseas cancer patients treated in India⁴² nearly 93% of respondents identified issues with language and food. Continuity of care and sharing of medical information was seen as a challenge within treatment pathways whether for screening, surgery or radiography^{23,29,36,37,40} including complexity of returning patients back home for palliative care and end of life care given domestic deficiencies in healthcare⁵³ and an example of end of life care received out of jurisdiction.³²

Detailed qualitative studies explore **the experience** of travel and treatment, including for patients and their families.^{34,45,56} Absence from home may be through temporary relocation or through continuous movement back and forth for treatments such as radiography.^{14,26,37,45,56} There are reported difficulties in parenting abroad during paediatric treatment^{35,56} but also benefits from being absent from the demands of home-life and in the support available overseas.^{36,45,56} Perhaps not surprisingly, there are significant **financial costs** of self-payers seeking treatment.^{14,26,34,41} Wider family impacts of treatment included family members taking leave without pay and quitting jobs,⁴¹ and 'financial toxicity'⁴³ in conflict related settings may involve sale of homes and possessions to fund treatments.

2.3 | Patient safety, risk and outcomes

Given time sensitivity of treatment for cancers, there are identified risks in eschewing local based treatment and waiting for travel approval and arrangements in order to continue treatment abroad.^{14,18,19,54} Aside from standard treatments, risks were discussed around particular Complementary and Alternative Treatments^{59,61} and experimental treatments⁵⁸ given a lack of evidence of efficacy and regulation. There were discussions of the evidence-base for more standard – albeit locally unavailable – interventions, notably Proton Beam Therapy.⁶⁵

The gold standard of cancer outcomes reporting is survival and recurrence rates – although clearly quality of care is irreducible to these. There is discussion of clinical benefits being balanced with potential disruption that travel overseas could cause.^{66,67} Little is known about the relative clinical outcomes for particular treatments, institutions, clinicians and localities. There is scant evidence on long or short-term follow-up of patients dispersing to home countries following treatments and the financial cost of states supporting the treatment of patients abroad. Only within clinical trials is randomisation feasible and the possibility of standard outcomes design studies. Some rarer cancers present difficulties for clinical trials with small numbers, and determining appropriate measures and timeframes are problematic.

There were some limited reports of follow up and positive early outcomes of particular interventions, for example a cohort of those treated with Proton Beam Therapy.⁶⁸ There are reports from Canada of differences in the delivery of treatments when similar services are received at home or outsourced to the United States.⁶⁹ For screening, there is evidence that medical travel leads to greater uptake for some migrant groups travelling from the United States to Korea.^{21,22,24} Elsewhere, transplant outcomes of travel from Hong Kong to China, with survival rates lower than local treatment but comparable to international ones, are reported.⁴⁹ The importance of further outcomes research is widely acknowledged including within transplantation programmes,²⁸ and radiotherapy,⁶⁹ but is a major gap in the existing literature, alongside our limited knowledge of patient safety and quality of care.

2.4 | Ethical, legal and regulatory considerations

Ethical issues include the impact of medical travel on doctor and patient relations, as well as the health system implications for both sender and receiving country.

There are reports that patient-doctor conflict may emerge during referral, for example in patients requesting medical reports from home doctors to affirm that the cancer treatment is not available locally, when in fact such care is available.¹⁸ Correspondingly, patients may press upon clinicians in treating countries to receive letters allowing them to return for follow-up treatments that are then funded by their domestic healthcare system.⁵³ Difficulties of ensuring **informed consent** in decision-making are identified where complex care is being delivered overseas.^{19,53,70} Interests of the patient, patient autonomy, conflict of interest, and fairness raise further ethical questions.⁵³ Treatment within a commodified relationship has the potential to generate financial conflicts of interest.¹⁸

Patients' families may request that the treating physician not disclose the cancer diagnosis to the patient.^{18,53} The precise role of home doctors in offering advice for prospective travellers is contentious for forms of cancer treatments, as it is with all travel abroad for medical treatment.⁴⁹ The nature of cancer pathology also generates specific dilemmas, including where travel for treatment at a late staging of the disease^{47,71} may be accompanied by unrealistic expectations of what intervention can achieve.⁵³

Health system questions for destination countries include whether providing cancer treatments – across private and public facilities – to international patients do cross subsidise and benefit local populations, or whether incoming patients are a drain on resources and facilities.⁵³

For home healthcare system implications, articles are replete with the fundamental questions of *who* gets access, to *what* and *how*? Resource implications include the public costs of those seeking treatment and follow-up treatment overseas,^{30,53} resource allocation decisions, including elites having priority access to travel support,⁷² and corruption within decision-making.¹⁹ Decisions to seek treatment abroad that are borne from mistrust of local care^{19,30} raise fundamental questions about the relationship between governments and their citizens.

There are reports about legal concerns related to treatments that are currently non-funded or non-standard treatments,^{62,65,73} including those that are experimental, complementary and alternative medicine,^{59,61} and the advertising of treatments.⁷⁴ There is some debate on the regulation of stem/gene experimental interventions, including the lack of evidence for advertised treatments,⁷⁵ and the regulation of clinics that offer diverse treatments including for cancer.^{61,76}

3 | DISCUSSION

This review has identified a variety of articles and commentaries around transnational oncology treatment: a rich vein of single case-note discussions, analysis of administrative data, and detailed coverage of motivations, treatment processes and travel experiences. Largest volumes of flows do not garner most coverage; there is inverse coverage of some childhood cancer-related treatments, particularly Proton Beam Therapy. There are also sizeable flows about which little is known, including travel to and from the Middle East but also concerning flows within the Asia region. Studies related to cancer screening mainly focus on Korean-Americans. The picture of transnational oncology treatment (patient numbers, cancer diagnosis, treatment options) remains sketchy. This is perhaps surprising given analysis of provider literature marketing medical treatments to overseas patients suggests standard cancer treatments are the most prevalently marketed of all clinical specialities. Within broader coverage of medical treatment abroad, a number of reported studies do mention cancer treatment but relatively few studies focus on cancer patients and their pathways and experiences in detail. For example, specialist London hospitals deliver cancer treatments to international patients but within the academic literature there is little coverage of cancer treatment experience per se.⁷⁷

Three travel itineraries are identifiable. First, individual travellers to treatment centres, drawing upon knowledge of acquaintances, and family and friends. Second, patients formally referred by their treating clinician and health system (for both standard treatments and emerging technologies). Third, those who receive services abroad, typically screening, but for whom treatment is a less primary rationale for travel.^{21,23}

We can glean relatively little from published literature about South East Asia, but anecdotal understandings alongside some detailed empirical study of particular providers and cases (e.g., in Malaysia, Thailand and Singapore) do point to cancer treatments being delivered in these settings, including palliative care.^{31,32}

A clear limitation of the study being undertaken in English is its tendency to overlook activity relating to China and it is imperative to understand better such travel itineraries around screening and treatment. Our own work acknowledges a growing middle class in China looking to travel for services not easily available at home. For example, 2018 saw a huge rise in demand from Chinese patients for the HPV vaccine to protect girls and young women against cancers administered at private clinics. Estimates suggest that 2016–2018 two million women travelled to Hong Kong from China for HPV vaccinations.⁷⁸

The burden of breast cancer in low-income and middle-income countries will increase dramatically in the coming decades, raising questions about access and equity for cancer care. In 2017, 26% of low-income countries reported having no public pathology services¹ and this could accelerate travel for diagnosis and screening for those with sufficient financial resources. Better understanding the experiences relating to LMIC countries and Central and Eastern European states will also shape a fuller picture of transnational oncology treatment.

Alongside such geographical blind spots, we identify local, national and global questions which together would deepen our understanding of the totality of transnational oncology treatment. **Local:** We must better understand current travel patterns and other drivers including the motivations, decision-making, and metrics and guides to quality underpinning travel to and from particular places. Such studies should examine the social context of decisions and treatment, highlighting lay referral and support networks, travel companions, and wider family and community contributions that are practical, financial and emotional. There are knowledge gaps in the understanding of doctor-patient relationships, including ethical dilemmas of cancer treatments abroad that embrace communication, family role and culture. Insight into how commercialization and commodification (by clinics, hospital and aftercare settings) shape patients' experiences is needed. In short, we must contextualise cancer travel to understand health politics, health systems and provider behaviour in relation to the aims of quality healthcare: safety, effectiveness, patient-centeredness, timeliness, efficiency, and equity.⁷⁹

Better understanding about treatment decisions and continuity of care between home and destination countries will illuminate how transnational care relationships develop perhaps over many months, or even years [see⁸⁰]. This includes how cancer treatment is enmeshed in transnationalism; including expatriates treated overseas then returning home⁴³ and the role of diasporic flows, and networks. Cross-country coordination of health care services, patient-clinician communication surrounding overseas care-seeking behaviour, and post-treatment implications are areas that would benefit from health service research.³⁷

Relatively little is known about the up-take and experiences of experimental treatments, including information provided on these treatments and how it is understood, how such treatments are promoted, and patient decision-making. Regulatory divergence between home and overseas countries around prevention and screening, coupled with fast-moving developments such as 'liquid biopsy' or emerging protective treatments, could generate rapid flows. We must be alert to these emerging developments and the health benefits and costs, both at the individual and population level, that they generate in the short and longer term.

National questions coalesce around the financial and non-financial implications (e.g., loss of trust in domestic healthcare) of citizens travelling abroad. Funding cancer treatments for citizens overseas must be accompanied with allocative transparency around access, and the costs to the public purse.

Transnational oncology treatment is sensitive to domestic eligibility criteria, domestic regulation and waiting lists, and any changes in these may lead to new itineraries and routes. Patients experiencing delay in accessing urgent treatment will have unequal access to personal financial resources and therefore opportunities to circumnavigate waits. Such travel may have the effect of undermining the solidarity of healthcare provision and of reproducing or amplifying divisions. On the other hand, national decisions around outsourcing what are deemed fundamental treatments may potentially strain the contract between citizen and government, and prompt animosity from local health care professionals. Travel abroad will complicate how countries meet national cancer priorities such as screening targets.^{22,24}

Global: Patient travel overseas for treatment sits within the wider context of **trade** in cancer services⁸⁰ which also includes: tele-health (remote diagnosis, consultation and surveillance), establishing oncology centres and providing training abroad, and oncology professionals relocating overseas on a temporary or permanent basis to deliver care. We must explore how broader health trade in cancer care impacts local populations in both source and destination countries. Health trade is interrelated with health diplomacy and soft power; emerging bilateral relations between countries may include trade and support in healthcare and specialist cancer services. This includes scrutinising their impact on access to health services and on global health inequalities.

Finally, the current global challenges related to the Covid-19 pandemic have knock-on effects for cancer treatment and cancer travel. With patient treatment disrupted, there are potentially short and medium-term health system repercussions for source and destination countries.⁸¹ Whether Covid-19 serves to redraw the cartography of transnational oncology mobility in the longer-term remains a moot point.

4 | CONCLUSION

There is a clear and urgent global health research agenda around transnational oncology treatment. This may be captured under five main themes. First, research on *trajectories and itineraries* to systematically detail the flows of patients and where they go, and for what treatment. Second, in depth focus on *treatment decisions, experiences and outcomes*, including understanding the experiences of innovative and more routine treatments. Third, locating patient travel in *wider analysis and knowledge of health systems*, including costs and the context of domestic and overseas provision. Fourth, *professional perspectives*, of both home and overseas clinicians, including ethical dilemmas and experience in ensuring continuity of care. Fifth, situating such travel within the wider context of *health trade*, including professional migration, education and training, and tele-health. Tackling such an agenda is ambitious and will necessarily involve collaborative relationships, with the participation of academic and clinical researchers based across all regions. It will also be multidisciplinary, embracing epidemiology, health economics, health policy and politics, ethics, and health management.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was part-funded by the Wellcome Trust [ref: 204829] through the Centre for Future Health (CFH) at the University of York.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analysed in this study.

ORCID

Neil Lunt  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4501-1999>

REFERENCES

1. WHO 2019 Statistics. Accessed February 20, 2021. <https://www.who.int/data/data-collection-tools/who-mortality-database>
2. The Cancer Atlas. The economic burden of cancer. Accessed February 20, 2021. <https://canceratlas.cancer.org/taking-action/economic-burden>
3. OECD. Deaths From cancer (indicator). Accessed February 20, 2021. doi:10.1787/8ea65c4b-en
4. Pesec M, Sherertz T. Global health from a cancer care perspective. *Future Oncol*. 2015;11(15):2235-2245.
5. Horton R. Offline: why has global health forgotten cancer? *Lancet*. 2018;392(10150):806.
6. Cohen D. Cancer drugs: high price, uncertain value. *BMJ*. 2017;359:j4543.
7. Dilla T, Lizan L, Paz S, et al. Do new cancer drugs offer good value for money? The perspectives of oncologists, health care policy makers, patients, and the general population. *Patient Prefer Adherence*. 2016;10:1-7.

8. Crooks VA, Kingsbury P, Snyder J, Johnston R. What is known about the patient's experience of medical tourism? A scoping review. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2010;10(1):266.
9. Hanefeld J, Smith R, Horsfall D, Lunt N. What do we know about medical tourism - a review of the literature with discussion of its implications for the UK NHS as an example of a public health care system. *J Travel Med*. 2014;21(6):410–417.
10. Lunt N, Horsfall D, Hanefeld J. *Handbook on Medical Tourism and Patient Mobility*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar; 2015.
11. Pereira RT, Malone CM, Flaherty GT. Aesthetic journeys: a review of cosmetic surgery tourism. *J Travel Med*. 2018;25(1). Accessed September 30. doi:10.1093/jtm/tay042
12. Simopoulou M, Sfakianoudis K, Giannelou P, et al. Treating infertility: current affairs of cross-border reproductive care. *Open Med*. 2019;14(1):292–299.
13. Mathijssen A, Mathijssen FP. Diasporic medical tourism: a scoping review of quantitative and qualitative evidence. *Glob Health*. 2020;16(27):1–15.
14. Kaspar H. Searching for therapies, seeking for hope: transnational cancer care in Asia. *Mobilities*. 2018;14(1):1–17.
15. Burki TK. UK health tourism for private cancer care. *Lancet Oncol*. 2019;20(3):334.
16. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *Int J Soc Res Methodol*. 2005;8(1):19–32.
17. Anderson S, Allen P, Peckham S, Goodwin N. Asking the right questions: scoping studies in the commissioning of research on the organisation and delivery of health services. *Health Res Pol Syst*. 2008;6(1):7.
18. Al-Shamsi HO, Al-Hajeili M, Alrawi S. Chasing the cure around the globe: medical tourism for cancer care from developing countries. *J Glob Oncol*. 2018;4(4):1–3.
19. Alhendi B, Al-Saifi S, Khaja A. Medical tourism overseas: a challenge to Kuwait's healthcare system. *Int j travel med glob health*. 2020;8(1):22–30.
20. Alnakhi WK, Segal JB, Frick KD, Hussin A, Ahmed S, Morlock L. Treatment destinations and visit frequencies for patients seeking medical treatment overseas from the United Arab Emirates: results from Dubai Health Authority reporting during 2009–2016. *Trop Dis Travel Med Vaccines*. 2019;5(1):10.
21. Ko LK, Taylor VM, Yoon J, et al. The impact of medical tourism on colorectal screening among Korean Americans: a community-based cross-sectional study. *BMC Canc*. 2016;16(1):931.
22. Lee SY. Colorectal cancer screening among Korean Americans in Chicago: does it matter whether they had the screening in Korea or the US? *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev*. 2018;19(5):1387–1395.
23. Oh KM, Jun J, Zhou Q, Kreps G. Korean American women's perceptions about physical examinations and cancer screening services offered in Korea: the influences of medical tourism on Korean Americans. *J Community Health*. 2014;39(2):221–229.
24. Jang SH, Lee EJ, Lim JA, Vu T, Taylor VM, Ko LK. The role of medical tourism in cancer screening among Korean immigrant women. *Health Behavior and Policy Review*. 2019;6(5):522–533.
25. De Troia B, Fusi-Schmidhauser T. Building bridges: palliative care beyond borders. *Prog Palliat Care*. 2017;25(1):23–26.
26. Pian A. Care and migration experiences among foreign female cancer patients in France: neither medical tourism nor therapeutic immigration. *J Intercult Stud*. 2015;36(6):641–657.
27. Boeger Z. Incorporating mammography into an overseas referral metric: Tongan doctors' assessments of patient eligibility for medical travel. *Soc Sci Med*. 2020;254:112355.
28. Tiren-Verbeet NL, Cetin M, Alp E, Doganay M. Bone marrow transplantation and medical tourism at Erciyes university - a single center experience. *Int j travel med glob health*. 2018;6(1):1–6.
29. Ahwireng-Obeng F, van Loggerenberg C. Africa's middle class women bring entrepreneurial opportunities in breast care medical tourism to South Africa. *Int J Health Plann Manag*. 2011;26(1):39–55.
30. Chaleunvong K, Kamsa-Ard S, Suwanrungruang K, et al. Retrospective appraisal of cancer patients from Vientiane capital city, Lao people's democratic Republic (PDR), seeking treatment in Thailand. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev*. 2013;14(9):5435–5440.
31. McNamara KM. Rhythms of care: medical travels beyond the borders of Bangladesh. *East Asian Sci Technol Soc*. 2020;14:61–83.
32. Whittaker A. Dying overseas: Reflections on translations of care in international medical travel hospitals in Malaysia and Thailand. *East Asian Sci Technol Soc*. 2020;14:137–144.
33. Whittaker A. Outsourced' patients and their companions: stories from forced medical travellers. *Glob Publ Health*. 2015;10:485–500.
34. Kangas B. Hope from abroad in the international medical travel of Yemeni patients. *Anthropol Med*. 2007;14(3):293–305.
35. Crom DB. The experience of South American mothers who have a child being treated for malignancy in the United States. *J Pediatr Oncol Nurs*. 1995;12(3):104–112.
36. Fitch MI, Gray RE, McGowan T, et al. Travelling for radiation cancer treatment: patient perspectives. *Psycho Oncol*. 2003;12(7):664–674.
37. Ko E, Zúñiga ML, Palomino H, Peacher D, Watson M. Qualitative study of Latino cancer patient perspectives on care access and continuity in a rural, U.S.-Mexico border region. *J Immigr Minority Health*. 2018;20(3):674–679.

38. Crocetti E, Crotti N, Geddes M, Tournade MF. The immigration of Italian patients to foreign countries. Analysis of the Gustave Roussy Institute series. *Epidemiol Prev*. 1994;18(61):204–210.
39. Eisner W. Intra-european neurosurgical communication and treatment of rare indications-an option for small countries? *Stereotact Funct Neurosurg*. 2014;92(Suppl 2):253.
40. Awano N, Takamoto T, Kawakami J, et al. Issues associated with medical tourism for cancer care in Japan. *Jpn J Clin Oncol*. 2019;49(8):708–713.
41. Aung L. Childhood cancer: the hidden medical and non-medical costs and its impact on the family. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2009;53(5):877.
42. Sarkar B, Rastogi K, Munshi A, et al. Audit of financial, social and logistic concerns of overseas cancer patients treated at tertiary care centers in New Delhi. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2019;105(1):E450–E451.
43. Skelton M, Alameddine R, Saifi O, et al. High-cost cancer treatment across borders in conflict zones: experience of Iraqi patients in Lebanon. *JCO Glob Oncol*. 2020;(6):59–66.
44. Alshemmari S, Refaat S, Elbasmi A, Alsirafy S. Representation of expatriates among cancer patients in Kuwait and the need for culturally-competent care. *J Psychosoc Oncol*. 2012;30(3):380–385.
45. Cockle S, Ogden J. The 'radiation vacation': parents' experiences of travelling to have their children's brain tumours treated with proton beam therapy. *Health Psychology Open*. 2016;3(1):205510291664976.
46. Indelicato D, Bradley J, Sandler E, et al. Clinical outcomes following proton therapy for children with central nervous system tumors referred overseas. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2017;64(12):e26654.
47. Sikiti N. Audit of cervical cancer management at the colonial war memorial hospital; a retrospective study. *Int J Gynecol Obstetrics*. 2015;131(Suppl 5):43–44.
48. Khalaileh A, Levi I, Cohen-Arazi O, et al. The effect of bridging therapy on liver transplantation outcome for HCC, Hadas-sah experience. *HPB*. 2016;18:e557–e558.
49. Fan S, Wang H, Lam B. Follow-up of Chinese liver transplant recipients in Hong Kong. *Liver Transplant*. 2009;15(5):544–550.
50. Katz SJ, Verrilli D, Barer ML. Canadians' use of U.S. medical services: Canadians do come to the United States for care, but not to the extent of popular perception. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 1998;17(1):225–235.
51. Deamant CD, Liu E, Hinami K, Weinstein RA, Trick WE. From Albania to Zambia: travel back to country of origin as a goal of care for terminally ill patients. *J Palliat Med*. 2015;18(3):251–258.
52. Bergmark R, Barr D, Garcia R. Mexican immigrants in the US living far from the border may return to Mexico for health services. *J Immigr Minority Health*. 2010;12(4):610–614.
53. Benedetti DJ, Golshan M, Kesselheim JC. Going the distance: ethical issues arising when patients seek cancer care from international settings. *J Glob Oncol*. 2018;4(4):1–4.
54. Lassen-Ramshad Y, Mahajan A, Christensen L, et al. RO-15: challenges for sending patients with medulloblastoma for proton radiotherapy abroad. *Neuro Oncol*. 2016;18(Suppl 3):iii162. Accessed September 30, 2020. doi:10.1093/neuonc/now082.15
55. Lee KA, O'Sullivan C, Daly P, et al. Proton therapy in paediatric oncology: an Irish perspective. *Ir J Med Sci*. 2017;186(3):577–582.
56. Margolis R, Ludi E, Pao M, Wiener L. International adaptation: psychosocial and parenting experiences of caregivers who travel to the United States to obtain acute medical care for their seriously ill child. *Soc Work Health Care*. 2013;52(7):669–683.
57. Ang CY. A misdiagnosed spindle cell sarcoma. *Proceedings of Singapore Healthcare*. 2013;22(4):273–276.
58. Hreh M, Cohn CS, McKenna D, Gniadek TJ. Traveling treatment: medical tourism in the emerging era of potentially transmissible therapeutics. *Transfusion*. 2017;57(10):2549–2550.
59. Cheng JH, Chiang LY, Kuo DJ. Inadvertently boarding a pirate ship: disease progression in a paediatric patient with relapsed metastatic Ewing sarcoma receiving treatment at a centre for alternative therapy in Mexico. *BMJ Case Rep*. 2017;2017:bcr2016217858.
60. Wilson R, Wartenberg M, Lecoite E. Sarcoma care pathways – the patient viewpoint. *Eur J Canc*. 2017;72:S6.
61. Moss RW. Patient perspectives: tijuana cancer clinics in the post-NAFTA era. *Integr Canc Ther*. 2005;4(1):65–86.
62. O'Brien A, Sokol DK. Lessons from the Ashya king case. *BMJ*. 2014;349:g5563.
63. Jun J. Framing service, benefit, and credibility through images and texts: a content analysis of online promotional messages of Korean medical tourism industry. *Health Commun*. 2015;31(7):845–852.
64. Jun J, Oh K. Framing risks and benefits of medical tourism: a content analysis of medical tourism coverage in Korean American community newspapers. *J Health Commun*. 2015;20(6):720–727.
65. Gornall J. Proton beam therapy: more than a leap of faith? *BMJ*. 2012;345:e4917.
66. Dwyer M. Defining the role of proton therapy in the optimal management of paediatric patients in Australia and New Zealand. *J Med Imag Radiat Oncol*. 2015;60(1):105–111.
67. Hawkes N. Advantages of proton beam therapy in Ashya King's type of cancer are small, doctors say. *BMJ*. 2014;349:g5610.

68. Indelicato DJ, Bradley JA, Rotondo RL, et al. Single-institution outcomes following proton therapy for children with central nervous system tumors referred overseas. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2016;96(2):E551.
69. Dayes IS, Whelan TJ, Julian JA, et al. Cross-border referral for early breast cancer: an analysis of radiation fractionation patterns. *Curr Oncol*. 2006;13(4):124–129.
70. Senior K. Health migration and childhood cancer. *Lancet Oncol*. 2006;7(11):889.
71. Mancuso A. "Health: A Blessing to Defend, a Right to Uphold" – a manifesto for the rights of oncology patients. *Eur J Canc*. 2017;72:S121.
72. Bhaumik S. Indian doctors condemn move to fund treatments abroad for civil servants. *BMJ*. 2013;347:f5677.
73. Dyer C. Judge rules that boy with brain cancer can be treated in Prague. *BMJ*. 2014;349:g5570.
74. Kashihara H, Nakayama T, Hatta T, Takahashi N, Fujita M. Evaluating the quality of website information of private-practice clinics offering cell therapies in Japan. *Interact J Med Res*. 2016;5(2):59–69.
75. Charo R. On the Road (to a cure?) – stem-cell tourism and lessons for gene editing. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;374(10):901–903.
76. Prasad A. Resituating overseas stem cell therapy. *Regen Med*. 2017;12(7):743–748.
77. Lunt N, Exworthy M, Hanefeld J, Smith RD. International patients within the NHS: a case of public sector entrepreneurialism. *Soc Sci Med*. 2015;124:338–345.
78. Lunt N, Fung KW. Chinese medical tourists are 'dying to survive'. *East Asia Forum*. 2018;28.
79. Committee on Quality of Health Care in America, Institute of Medicine. *Crossing The Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2001.
80. Chanda R. Trade in health services. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2002;80:158–163.
81. Al-Shamsi HO, Abu-Gheida I, Rana S, et al. Challenges for cancer patients returning home during SARS-COV-19 pandemic after medical tourism - a consensus report by the Emirates oncology task force. *BMC Canc*. 2020;20:641.

How to cite this article: Lunt N, Fung K-w. Scoping the literature on patient travel abroad for cancer screening, diagnosis and treatment. *Int J Health Plann Mgmt*. 2021;1-12. doi:10.1002/hpm.3315